

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed May 29, 2008. Claims 19-25 and 34-39 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 19-25 and 34-39 were rejected. In order to expedite prosecution of this Application, Applicants amend Claims 19 and 34. Thus, Claims 19-25 and 34-39 remain pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 19-25 and 34-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,664,969 issued to Emerson et al. (hereinafter "*Emerson*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,023,558 issued to Grabowski (hereinafter "*Grabowski*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 19 and 34 are independent. Applicant respectfully submits that each of independent Claims 19 and 34 are patentable over the cited references. For example, amended Claim 19 recites "selecting blocks of graphics image data of said new image that are different from corresponding blocks of graphics image data of said previous image in a region of interest of said previous image specified by said destination device, wherein said region of interest is a portion of said previous image" (emphasis added). *Emerson* appears to disclose that video graphics data is analyzed to detect a change by dividing the video graphics data in a frame buffer into manageable blocks so that the blocks may be compared for previously transmitted data and current data (*Emerson*, column 7, lines 21-39). In response to detecting a change in a block, the block is transmitted to the remote console (*Emerson*, Abstract; lines 5-8). However, *Emerson* does not appear to disclose or even suggest selecting and transmitting only changed blocks that are located in a region of interest of a previous image specified by the destination device which is only a portion of the previous image.

Grabowski appears to disclose a method for conserving bandwidth by counting the number of colors present on a scanline, forming a new color palette for the scanline, and converting the colors to the new color palette (*Grabowski*, abstract, column 2, lines 15-26). Thus, *Grabowski* also does not appear to disclose or even suggest selecting and transmitting only changed blocks that are located in a region of interest of a previous image specified by the destination device which is only a portion of the previous image. Thus, Applicants respectfully

submit that the cited references, even if combined, do not appear to disclose or even suggest "selecting blocks of graphics image data of said new image that are different from corresponding blocks of graphics image data of said previous image in a region of interest of said previous image specified by said destination device, wherein said region of interest is a portion of said previous image" as recited by amended Claim 19 (emphasis added). Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 19 is patentable over the cited references.

Independent Claim 34, as amended, recites "the graphics adapter configured to select blocks of graphics image data of said new image that are different from corresponding blocks of graphics image data of said previous image in a region of interest of said previous image specified by said destination device, wherein said region of interest is a portion of said previous image" (emphasis added). Thus, at least for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claim 19, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 34 is also patentable over the cited references.

Claims 20-25 and 35-39 that depend respectively from independent Claims 19 and 34 are also patentable over the cited references at least because they incorporate the limitations of respective Claims 19 and 34 and also add additional elements that further distinguish the cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 19-25 and 34-39 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this Response. If, however, Applicants have overlooked the need for any fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

/James L. Baudino/

James L. Baudino

Reg. No. 43,486

Date: August 6, 2008

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-3451